

**JOINT WORK SESSION
FLAGSTAFF CITY COUNCIL/COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

***A M E N D E D A G E N D A**

**4:00 P.M. AND 6:00 P.M.
MONDAY
NOVEMBER 18, 2013**

**COUNCIL CHAMBERS
211 WEST ASPEN AVENUE
FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA**

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call:

NOTE: One or more Councilmembers/Supervisors may be in attendance telephonically or by other technological means.

CHAIRMAN RYAN
SUPERVISOR ARCHULETA
SUPERVISOR BABBOTT

SUPERVISOR FOWLER
SUPERVISOR METZGER

MAYOR NABOURS
VICE MAYOR EVANS
COUNCILMEMBER BAROTZ
COUNCILMEMBER BREWSTER

COUNCILMEMBER ORAVITS
COUNCILMEMBER OVERTON
COUNCILMEMBER WOODSON

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Public Participation enables the public to address the Council about an items that are not the agenda. Public Participation appears on the agenda twice, at the beginning and at the end of the work session. You may speak at one or the other, but not both. Anyone wishing to comment on an item that is on the agenda is asked to fill out a speaker card and submit it to the recording clerk. When the item comes up on the agenda, your name will be called. You may address the Council up to three times throughout the meeting, including comments made during Public Participation. Please limit your remarks to three minutes per item to allow everyone an opportunity to speak.

5. *Project Updates

**Ft. Tuthill Entrance
89A Closure
Transportation District/Sales Tax Question Update**

6. Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030: Place Matters - Public Hearing #1

7. Public Participation

8. Informational Items To/From Chairman, Supervisors and County Manager/Mayor, Council and City Manager.

9. Adjournment

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING OF NOTICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing notice was duly posted at Flagstaff City Hall on _____, at _____ a.m./p.m. in accordance with the statement filed by the City Council with the City Clerk.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 2013.

Elizabeth A. Burke, MMC, City Clerk

Memorandum

6.

CITY OF FLAGSTAFF

To: The Honorable Mayor and Council
From: Kimberly Sharp, AICP, Comprehensive Planning Manager
Co-Submitter: Jim Cronk, Planning Director
Date: 11/14/2013
Meeting Date: 11/18/2013



TITLE:

Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030: Place Matters - Public Hearing #1

DESIRED OUTCOME:

As Public Hearing #1 for the ***Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030: Place Matters***, it is the intent of the Mayor, City Council and the County Board of Supervisors to hear public testimony and concerns from both city and county residents and businesses regarding the Plan.

Public Hearing will begin at 4:00 p.m. and open again at 6:00 p.m.

INFORMATION:

Please see attached Staff Summary.

Attachments: Summary
P&Z Comments



STAFF SUMMARY

City of Flagstaff – Comprehensive Planning

November 14, 2013

To: Flagstaff City Council and Coconino County Board of Supervisors

Meeting: November 18, 2013 Joint City/County Meeting

From: Jim Cronk – City of Flagstaff Planning Director
Kimberly Sharp, AICP –Comprehensive Planning Manager
John Aber, Assistant Director Coconino County Community Development

Re: **Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030: Place Matters**
Public Hearing #1 – 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. – Flagstaff City Hall, Council Chambers, 211 West Aspen Avenue, Flagstaff, Arizona 86001

Dear Mayor, Council and Supervisors

Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030: Place Matters document titled “Public Hearing Draft”, dated August 2013 is before you and the public today as a broad policy document for consideration of City Council and Board of Supervisors. The intent of Public Hearing #1 is to hear the public’s comments on the draft document, so that both elected bodies may hear the community’s voice, and then deliberate in their respective chambers at a later date.

The main contents of the plan include an Introduction and three broad categories identified as the Natural Environment; the Built Environment; and the Human Environment. The Introduction includes a vision and guiding principles; a description of the region; background, existing conditions, and trends; how the plan was developed; and how it will be used and implemented over time. Each of the three broad categories of Natural/Built/Human Environments includes several elements. Each element includes specific goals and policies regarding future development in the region. The three categories and their respective elements are listed below.

Natural Environment	Built Environment	Human Environment
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Environmental Planning and Conservation• Open Space• Water Resources• Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Community Character• Land Use and Growth Areas• Transportation• Cost of Development• Public Buildings, Services, Facilities, and Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Neighborhoods, Housing, and Urban Conservation• Economic Development• Recreation

Maps

The Plan contains numerous maps intended to illustrate a variety of regional features, including natural resources, population, housing, roads, trails, utilities, land ownership patterns, and other information. Unlike the current Flagstaff Regional Plan, this Plan update does not include a parcel-based “Land Use Map” per se, but instead includes a more generalized “Future Growth Illustration.” The Future Growth

Illustration is intended to depict a generalized conceptual growth pattern without specifically identifying a particular land use on a parcel-by-parcel basis, which is contained in the Zoning Code. In other words, the emphasis in this plan update is on the goals and policies contained in each plan element rather than on a particular land use designation on a map.

Goals and Policies

The Plan is structured so that there is at least one or more goals and related policies under each subsection of each element in the plan. The goals are high-level statements of a desired future condition, and the policies are specific statements of intent designed to accomplish the goals. As a collection of goals and policies, the Plan is a policy document and not a regulatory document. As such, the broad, high-level goals and policies on various topics may occasionally conflict. This is a normal characteristic of a policy plan and is not a problem. Decision-makers such as the Planning and Zoning Commissions, City Council and Board of Supervisors have broad discretion in applying the goals and policies of the Plan in relation to any given situation and may choose which goals or policies to emphasize over others as they deem appropriate.

It should also be noted that there are certain policies in the plan that only apply in the City and other policies that only apply in the County. Other goals and policies are more general and could apply throughout the region. When it comes down to decision-making relative to future development in the City and the County, each jurisdiction retains full authority in their respective areas.

Plan Hierarchy

The Regional Plan holds a different position in the hierarchy of plans at the City versus the County. At the City, the Regional Plan serves as the City's General Plan, so it is the primary planning document at the City. By contrast, in the unincorporated County, the Regional Plan becomes another member of our "family" of plans. The Coconino County Comprehensive Plan is the overall primary planning document County-wide, including the unincorporated portions of the greater Flagstaff area covered by the Regional Plan. In addition, the County has adopted five local area plans within the Regional Plan boundaries.

Public Process

The update process began in 2008 with a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) established by ordinance 2008-34. The original CAC members were selected from publicly solicited applicants, both city and county residents, and were selected by Councilmembers and Supervisors with the intent of a diverse group representing the community at large. Two Councilmembers and two Supervisors along with the City Manager and Deputy County Manager, as the Steering Committee, have continued to advise the Core Planning Team (city planners, county planners and FMPO Manager) for the past five years as well.

From February 2009-July 2013, the CAC met monthly and took into consideration existing Regional Plan goals and policies along with the thousands of public comments gathered on the state-statute required topics for the plan. With over 300 open houses, focus group meetings and working group meetings, the Regional Plan was drafted as a policy document reflecting this community's values.

A public review of the *Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030: Place Matters* document was released March 28, 2013. Over 700 editing comments were gathered during the 60-day public comment period, via e-mail, mail, and comment cards. During this public comment period, 60 community groups hosted a regional plan presentation and discussion. In June and July, 2013, the CAC re-convened to review and incorporate the suggested edits from the public and initial Planning & Zoning Commission discussions.

The Flagstaff Planning and Zoning Commission, Coconino County Planning and Zoning Commission, Flagstaff City Council and the Coconino County Board of Supervisors have had the opportunity to review and comment on the *Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030: Place Matters*, titled “Public Hearing Draft” dated August 2013.

The Flagstaff Planning and Zoning Commission recommended adoption by Flagstaff City Council with a list of 42 suggested edits (attached) on October 23, 2013. For the City, the *Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030: Place Matters* will supersede the *Flagstaff Area Land Use and Transportation Plan* (2001) and serves as the City’s General Plan.

The County Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval to the Board of Supervisors without any changes on October 29, 2013. For Coconino County, the *Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030: Place Matters* will supersede the *Flagstaff Area Land Use and Transportation Plan* (2001) and will be an amendment to the *Coconino County Comprehensive Plan*.

The November 18, 2013 Joint City Council and County Board of Supervisors meeting is the official *Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030: Place Matters - Public Hearing #1*.

RECOMMENDATION

The purpose of the meeting is to receive public comment and for the Council and Supervisors to ask questions of staff. There will be no debate or decisions made. Decisions will be made at the subsequent:

- **County Supervisors Meeting** - December 3rd (3:00 p.m. County Administration Building, 219 E. Cherry Street) and
- **City Council Meeting** – December 3rd (6:00 p.m. Council Chambers, 211 West Aspen Avenue). It is anticipated that Council will make their final decision for adoption on December 17.

Flagstaff Planning and Zoning Commission Suggested Edits to the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030: Place Matters - Public Hearing Draft

Item#	Page #	Source	Edit/Comment
1	General	P&Z Commission	Move Comprehensive List of Goals & Policies to an Appendix in back
2	General	P&Z Commission	As none of the policies mention ordinances or programs that already exist within the City, it could be construed by the reader that the City is deficient in certain areas. The proposed following statement acknowledges existing programs the City has in place that can supplement the new Plan's policies. It may function well as an introduction to the new Appendix B., Comprehensive List of Goals and Policies (Assumes all strategies have been moved to a separate document): <u>"This appendix is a comprehensive list of all the goals and policies included in the Flagstaff Regional Plan. As noted previously in the Introduction, these goals and policies support the community's vision for Flagstaff and its region. They are, therefore, a statement or reflection of future intent and achievement (goals) supported by deliberate statements on how to achieve the goals and guide decisions (policies). While all the goals and policies in the Plan are directed to future needs and accomplishments, it is important to understand that many of them also reflect ongoing programs, initiatives, and actions already implemented by City, County, and other policy and decision makers."</u>
3	I-3	P&Z Commission	From first paragraph: Remove the clause "and their achievement over time depends on putting into effect specific, carefully framed policies."
4	II-5	P&Z Commission	Provide date for Map #4. Text says "Other analysis suggests a higher percentage," This is a large discrepancy, where does this analysis come from? Revise text to read, "Flagstaff also has a substantial seasonal population, <u>with Census data and City of Flagstaff Housing studies indicating that second homes make up approximately 10 - 18% of the total housing stock in the city.</u> "
5	II-8	P&Z Commission	Second sentence under <i>Growth Constraints</i> : verbiage seems harsh, is this sentence necessary? - Delete?
6	III-1	P&Z Commission	Somewhere we should discuss the FMPO, what it really is, is it elected officials or appointed? City and County representation, etc. - Add to Glossary
7	III-1	P&Z Commission	Third sentence under <i>How this Plan is Used</i> , add : "This plan will be used as a guide, or roadmap, for the future of the city and region, <u>and it acts as a framework for public action and private decisions, thus striving to serve as a basis in the decision making process."</u>
8	III-1	P&Z Commission	Replace the last paragraph with this statement from the old regional plan, " <u>General Plans are not static documents; they recognize growth as a dynamic process, which may require revisions to the plan as circumstances or changes warrant.</u> "
9	IV-8	CAC Recommendation	Susan Bean has offered a revision of the paragraph following <i>How to use the Natural and Cultural Environment Map</i> , see attached PDF
10	IV-9	P&Z Commission	Add the following sentence to the Importance paragraph of the <i>Wildlife Linkages</i> section: " <u>Of particular importance are the corridors west of Flagstaff linking the San Francisco Peaks with the Rim.</u> " This change is suggested because wildlife corridors have been largely compromised, thus making the existing corridors critical.
11	IV-10	P&Z Commission	Remove 2 sentences in middle paragraph: "More than a dozen facilities operate within or adjacent to Coconino County that produce significant amounts of carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, volatile organic compounds, sulfur dioxide, particulate matter, or ammonia." and "However, on some days, perceptible reductions in visibility do occur."

Item#	Page #	Source	Edit/Comment
12	IV-12	P&Z Commission	Delete the words "through local action" from the last sentence on the page
13	IV-12	P&Z Commission	Policy E&C.2.1. "Promote programs and incentives for the reduction of fossil fuel..." If the City has an ordinance, then it would state , " <u>continue to effect the reduction of fossil fuel through these existing programs.</u> "
14	V-4	P&Z Commission	Add to bullet 10: " <u>and by limiting development in flood-prone areas</u> "
15	V-5	P&Z Commission	<p>Policy OS 1.2. While observing private property rights, preserve natural resources and priority open lands areas with a high concentration of natural resources, under the general ... and the Natural Environmental Planning and Conservation maps.</p> <p>Policy OS. 1.3. Use open spaces areas with a high concentration of natural resources as natural environment buffer zones ...</p> <p>Policy OS 1.4. Use open space areas with a high concentration of natural resources as opportunities ...</p> <p>Policy OS 1.5. Integrate the qualities of open space areas with a high concentration of natural resources qualities into the built environment.</p>
16	V-6	P&Z Commission	Language under <i>Item #7</i> was revised : "Zoning: <u>Within the City</u> the Public Lands Forest (PLF) Zone applies to areas of the City designated as Coconino National Forest. <u>All other lands, including for example, county, municipal or State Trust lands, which may be classified as "suitable for conservation purposes", may be designated as the Public Open Space (POS) Zone.</u> Once a parcel is purchased, traded, or donated for open space in the City, a zone change to the PLF <u>or POS Zone, assuming permission has been granted by the property owner, will formally</u> recognize the new designation. The County Zoning Ordinance also includes an Open Space and Conservation Zone for the purpose of <u>protecting and zoning</u> open space.
17	VI-8	P&Z Commission	Define the term "Gray Water." - Put in glossary
18	VI-18	P&Z Commission	Stormwater Facilities Map: Define dashed line (city limits)
19	VII-3	P&Z Commission	Recommend modifying one of the energy efficiency policies to highlight <u>passive solar design and technology</u> .
20	VIII-23	P&Z Commission	Policy CC.3.1. " <u>Encourage</u> " instead of "Require"
21	VIII-26	P&Z Commission	Possibly remove last sentence in first paragraph: "However, without coordination, preservation, and promotion, it is possible that these activities and resources can be lost through indifference or unintended development decisions or policies."
22	IX-55 (Revised Land Use Chapter)	P&Z Commission	<p>The maps should be seen as a tool for setting priorities for specific parcels. A location on a map should give clues as to the appropriate priorities for that place. With that in mind, mapping should be done with a keen awareness of where potential conflicts may exist and avoid them whenever possible. The places I see, when I consider this, are places where Activity Centers overlap areas identified as having a high degree of natural resources. Specifically, I recommend relocation or rescaling of the following Activity Centers: S1, S6, S16, S17, U2. The following policy suggestion addresses concerns about Activity Center boundaries: Proposed new policy that addresses the boundaries of pedestrian sheds: Under <i>Activity Centers</i>, Policy.16.16.; "<u>Actual pedestrian-shed boundaries will be established considering opportunities and constraints posed by natural resources and man-made barriers like steep slopes and floodplains, or the interstate, road networks, and existing development patterns.</u>"</p>

Item#	Page #	Source	Edit/Comment
23	IX-19 (Revised Land Use Chapter)	P&Z Commission	Proposed new policy that addresses where density within activity centers should be concentrated: Under <i>Applicable to All Land Uses</i> , Goal LU3, Policy LU.3.5.; " <u>Encourage the distribution of density within neighborhoods to relate to the access of associated activity centers and corridors, infrastructure, transportation, and natural constraints like slopes and drainages.</u> " See also Activity Centers, page IX-50 in revised land use chapter.
24	IX-49	Staff Recommendation	Redefine "Activity Centers" and "Neighborhoods" using definitions from the glossary for consistency
25	X-1	P&Z Commission	Borrowing from the previous plan, this sentence is well-worded and might be added to the intro: " <u>The Transportation Element of the Regional Plan can be summed up in 5 words: safety, balance, connectivity, efficiency, and diversity.</u> "
26	X-5	P&Z Commission	Policy T.1.8 is unclear, delete it and revise Policy T.1.1. to say, " <u>In future development, integrate a balanced, multimodal regional transportation system.</u> "
27	X-6	P&Z Commission	Tables are confusing to read and hard to interpret. The symbols for the table are to be labeled , " <u>High Priority, Medium Priority, and Low Priority</u> " and accompanying text reorganized so that it better relates to the table.
28	X-13	P&Z Commission	Policy T.5.6. and the <i>Note</i> at bottom was removed . The following was added to Policy T.5.7: "and the needs of transit-dependent individuals <u>who can only get around via public transit, who do not own a car or cannot drive.</u> " Policy T.5.2 was revised : "Provide public transit centers and <u>transit options</u> that are effectively distributed..."
29	X-14	P&Z Commission	Policy T.6.4 revised : " <u>Encourage bikeways and bicycle infrastructure to serve the needs of a full range of bicyclist experience levels.</u> "
30	X-11	Staff Recommendation	Planned Transit Service Levels Map #26: add a "Standard" level of service buffer on JWP/4th from I-17 to Butler. It was omitted because NAIPTA's plan only had funding assumed to 2030 and couldn't afford the service in that area and there was no definitive calls for development at the time. The Growth Illustration Map shows future development in the area so the Transit Service Map should reflect that growth.
31	X-15	Staff Recommendation	FUTS Map #27: need to add planned trail systems
32	X-1	P&Z Commission	Add to the introduction: " <u>The Transportation Element of the Regional Plan can be summed up in 5 words: safety, balance, connectivity, efficiency, and diversity.</u> Because transportation right-of-way is the most heavily used and experienced public space; because network design influences whether an area can be urban, suburban or rural; and because streetscapes strongly contribute to community character, future land use patterns and transportation systems must be planned together. The primary goals of the regional transportation system are to improve the mobility of people and goods, provide choices to enhance the quality of life, provide infrastructure to support economic development, protect the natural environment and sustain public support for transportation planning efforts. In order to meet these goals, this element promotes safety; context sensitive solutions; complete streets; environmental responsibility; the integration and connectivity of transportation systems; efficient system management and operation; and improvements to existing intermodal transportation systems. This chapter addresses the everyday need to move about the community. Individual transportation modes are addressed starting with

Item#	Page #	Source	Edit/Comment
33	X-3	P&Z Commission	Road Network Illustration Map #25: a. Connect Lockett Rd to 66 b. Add two Existing Interchange symbols at Flagstaff Ranch exit and the airport exit
34	X-5	P&Z Commission	Policy T.1.8. Plan for development to provide on-site, publicly owned transportation improvements. This policy is unclear. Delete it and revise Policy T.1.1. In future development, integrate a balanced, multimodal regional transportation system."
35	X-6	P&Z Commission	The table is to be better titled and symbols in the legend labeled , " <u>High Priority, Medium Priority, and Low Priority</u> " Accompanying text can be reorganized so that it better relates to the table.
36	X-11	P&Z Commission	Planned Transit Service Levels Map #26: Add a "Standard" level of service buffer on JWP/4th from I-17 to Butler. It was omitted because NAIPTA's plan only had funding assumed to 2030 and couldn't afford the service in that area and there was no definitive calls for development at the time. The Growth Illustration Map shows future development in the area so the Transit Service Map should reflect that growth.
37	X-13	P&Z Commission	Policy T.5.2. Provide public transit centers and <u>transit options</u> that are effectively distributed throughout the region to increase access to public transit. Policy T.5.6. Enhance public transit options in key areas so that one could live without a car. Policy T.5.7. Coordinate with NAIPTA to establish rural transit service within the region that is consistent with county land use plans, based on funding availability, cost effectiveness, location of major trip generators, distance between generators, and the needs of transit-dependent individuals <u>who can only get around via public transit, who do not own a car or cannot drive.</u> Note: Transit dependent individuals: Those who can only get around via public transit, who do not own a car or cannot drive.
38	X-14	P&Z Commission	Policy T.6.4. Encourage bikeways and bicycle infrastructure to serve the needs of a full range of bicyclist experience levels.
39	X-15	P&Z Commission	FUTS Map #27: Add planned trail systems to map.
40	XII-8	P&Z Commission	Include citation in the Cinder Lake Landfill paragraph: "...In March 1999 the City purchased the landfill property (175 acres) plus an additional 168 acres from the U.S. Forest Service. <u>According to the City's Solid Waste section</u> , the landfill is expected to have a useful life of approximately 40 years..."
41	XII-8	P&Z Commission	Include language about the reduction of waste volume and extending the life of the landfill. <i>See attached pg. XII-8</i>
42	XII-10	P&Z Commission	Insert new statement after <i>Public Infrastructure</i> : " <u>Flagstaff Citizen's Cemetery, located on City-owned land on San Francisco St. currently has adequate capacity for this planning cycle. See <i>Citizen's Cemetery Master Plan, 2000</i> "</u>